

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN ARMSTRONG, et al., on behalf  
of themselves and as  
representatives of the class,

Plaintiffs,

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Governor of  
the State of California;  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION;  
MICHAEL MINOR, Director of the  
Division of Juvenile Justice; DR.  
JEFFREY A. BEARD, Secretary of  
the California Department of  
Corrections and Rehabilitation;  
JENNIFER SHAFFER, the Executive  
Officer of the Board of Parole  
Hearings; DIANA TOCHE, Acting  
Director of the Division of  
Correctional Health Care  
Services; CHRIS MEYER, Director  
of the Division of Facility  
Planning, Construction and  
Management; KATHLEEN DICKINSON,  
Director of Adult Institutions;  
and DAN STONE, Director of  
Division of Adult Parole  
Operations,

Defendants.

No. C 94-2307 CW  
ORDER REGARDING  
MONITORING

On February 4, 2013, the Court directed the parties to file a  
brief addressing whether it would be appropriate for the Office of  
Inspector General (OIG) to play a role in monitoring state prisons  
in this action for compliance with the rights of inmates with  
disabilities. Docket No. 2231. Pursuant to the Court's  
direction, the parties filed briefs addressing this topic. Docket

Nos. 2252, 2290, 2291.<sup>1</sup>

Having reviewed the written submissions by the parties and their oral presentations at the hearing, the Court declines to establish OIG monitoring at this time.<sup>2</sup> In their briefs and in previous status reports, the parties raised issues about the ongoing monitoring that is taking place in this case pursuant to the Court's prior orders. At this time, the Court directs the parties to meet and confer, with the assistance of the Court's expert as needed, on how to resolve these issues and improvements that might be made on the monitoring process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 6/3/2013

  
CLAUDIA WILKEN  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants move to strike Plaintiffs' brief for violation of the ten-page page limit set by the Court. Docket No. 2295. At the hearing held on May 16, 2013, Defendants declined to pursue the motion. Accordingly, the motion is DENIED as moot (Docket No. 2295).

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs' administrative motion to submit supplemental evidence is DENIED as moot (Docket No. 2323).